

ON THREE UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF JOHANNES DE RAEY TO JOHANNES CLAUBERG*

ANDREA STRAZZONI

In the last years the interest in epistolary transmission of philosophical ideas has grown in a remarkable way, leading to massive projects of discovery, transcription and digitalization of letters from early modern age¹. The present study has a more limited purpose: focusing on the early dissemination of Cartesian ideas in Dutch academies, it aims to present a transcription and a commentary of three unpublished letters of the Dutch Cartesian philosopher Johannes de Raey (1620-1702), addressed to his former student and friend Johannes Clauberg (1622-1665). Mainly containing suggestions concerning the defence of Cartesian philosophy, these letters, dating back to 1651,

* I thank the anonymous referee and Erik-Jan Bos for the useful remarks on this paper.

1 This is the case of the research project *Networking the Republic of Letters, 1550-1750*, (www.culturesofknowledge.org), based in Oxford, and the website *Circulation of Knowledge and Learned Practices in the 17th-century Dutch Republic* (ckcc.huygens.knaw.nl), aimed to put light, mainly by means of digitalizations, on the correspondence networks in early modern age. Cf. also ERIK-JAN BOS, *Epistolarium Voetianum II*, «Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis» 79/1, 1999, pp. 39-73; ID., *The Correspondence between Descartes and Henricus Regius*, Proefschrift Universiteit Utrecht 2002; ID., *Two Unpublished Letters of René Descartes: On the Printing of the Meditations and the Groningen Affair*, «Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie» 92, 2010, pp. 290-302; JEROEN VAN DE VEN, ERIK-JAN BOS, *Se Nihil Daturum – Descartes's Unpublished Judgement of Comenius's Pansophiae Prodomus* (1639), «British Journal for the History of Philosophy» 12/3 (2004), pp. 369-386; *Communicating Observations in Early Modern Letters (1500-1675) - Epistolography and Epistemology in the Age of the Scientific Revolution*, ed. by Dirk van Miert, London-Turin, The Warburg Institute - Nino Aragno Editore 2013.

1652 and 1661, bear witness of the existence of a certain cooperation in rebuking the critiques moved by Jacob Revius in his *Statera philosophiae cartesianae* (1650) and by Cyriacus Lentulus in his *Nova Renati Descartes sapientia* (1651), refuted in Clauberg's *Defensio cartesiana* (1652). Before addressing the contents of the letters, therefore, some remarks on the connections between De Raey and Clauberg are appropriate, and particularly concerning the dissemination of Cartesian ideas in the Low Countries, the strategies adopted by De Raey and Clauberg in order to ease the introduction of the new philosophy in the academy, and the criticisms moved by their adversaries.

EARLY CONTACTS AND PHILOSOPHICAL CONTEXT

De Raey and Clauberg, to be counted among the first teachers of Cartesian philosophy, were active in Dutch and German universities since the late 1640s. De Raey, after having studied at Utrecht University under the guidance of Henricus Regius, graduated in arts and medicine at Leiden University in 1647, where he started his private teaching in 1648 and was allowed to provide public lectures and preside disputations in 1651². While officially commenting Aristotle's *Problemata* in his lectures and disputations, De Raey taught the basics of Cartesian physics by demonstrating their presence in the

2 De Raey started to privately teach Cartesian philosophy in 1647 or, more probably, in 1648, being then formally forbidden of teaching without the permission of University authorities, according to an act of the University Senate of 11th of June 1648: cf. PHILIP C. MOLHUYSEN (ed.), *Bronnen tot de Geschiednis der Leidsche Universiteit*, 's-Gravenhage, M. Nijhoff 1918, vol. III, p. 11. This act followed a letter of Jacob Revius to University Curators of 8th of June 1648, where the theologian complained about De Raey's private teaching on metaphysics (*ibid.*, p. 15*).

works of Aristotle. This was aimed to support the acceptance of the new paradigm, seemingly more close to the original Aristotelian thought than that of the Scholastics. Eventually, his disputations *Ad Problemata Aristotelis* were later re-edited as his *Clavis philosophiae naturalis aristotelico-cartesiana* (1654), the most important treatise of his early philosophical career³. Johannes Clauberg, professor at the Herborn University since 1649, after having studied in Bremen, Groningen and Leiden, carried on a similar attempt in his *Defensio cartesiana* (1652) and *Logica vetus et nova* (1654, 1658). His *Defensio* being an answer to the attacks of Revius and Lentulus, in which Clauberg provided a specimen of Cartesian logic and philosophy, and his *Logica* a comprehensive development of such a specimen, Clauberg's aim was to give a scholastic form to Cartesian philosophy. First of all, through the development of a complete methodology to be adopted in discovery, interpretation and teaching, based on a combination of Scholastic logic with Descartes's method⁴. Whereas De Raey exposed Descartes's principles of physics hammering in their concordance with Aristotle's philosophy, Clauberg straightforwardly focused on

3 De Raey's exposition of Descartes's principles was concealed by his official task to provide a commentary of Aristotle's *Problemata*, since the teaching of Cartesian philosophy was still under the ban of 1647. In any case, the University Curators encouraged his exposition of Cartesian philosophy: cf. JOHANNES DE RAEY, *Clavis philosophiae naturalis, seu introductio ad naturae contemplationem, aristotelico-cartesiana*, Lugd. Batavor., ex officina Johannis et Danielis Elsevier 1654, *Epistola dedicatoria*, pp. XVI-XVII (unnumbered). Cf. ANDREA STRAZZONI, *La filosofia aristotelico-cartesiana di Johannes De Raey*, «Giornale critico della filosofia italiana» Settima serie – VII/1, 2011, pp. 107-132. On the relevant context, cf. PAUL DIBON, *La philosophie néerlandaise au siècle d'or. Tome I. L'enseignement philosophique dans les universités à l'époque précartésienne (1575-1650)*, Paris-Amsterdam-Londres-New York, Elsevier Publishing Company, 1954; THEO VERBEEK, *Descartes and the Dutch. Early Reactions to Cartesian Philosophers, 1637-1650*, Carbondale and Edwardsville, Southern Illinois University Press 1992.

4 Cf. MASSIMILIANO SAVINI, *L'insertion du cartésianisme en logique: la Logica vetus & nova de Johannes Clauberg*, «Revue de Métaphysique et de Morale» 49, 2006, pp. 73-88; ID., *Johannes Clauberg: methodus cartesiana et ontologie*, Paris, Vrin 2011, pp. 197-268; ANDREA STRAZZONI, *A Logic to End Controversies: The Genesis of Clauberg's Logica Vetust et Nova*, «Journal of Early Modern Studies» II/2, 2013, pp. 123-149.

the actual exposition of a new, or novantique logic to be adopted in academic teaching. Both, however, shared the same needs and pursued the same goals: this being a consequence of the particular context of their activity but also of their close friendship.

According to the *Epistola dedicatoria* opening Clauberg's *Logica vetus et nova*, their first contacts took place in 1648, when Tobias Andreae – to whom Clauberg submitted the first draft of his *Ontosophia*, before to start his *grand tour* to France and England in 1646⁵ – suggested him to head to Leiden in order to have a better acquaintance with Cartesian philosophy, under the guidance of De Raey, the best teacher of the new philosophy even according to Descartes, as reported by Clauberg⁶. Called to Herborn University at the end of 1648, he matriculated at the University of Leiden in November of the same year and stayed there until the summer of 1649, as he started his teaching at Herborn University in September⁷. As stated in the *Epistola dedicatoria* opening Clauberg's *Physica* (1664), a thanksgiving to De Raey for having read his *Theoria corporum viventium* and *Corporis et animae coniunctio*⁸, De Raey provided him with teachings on physics and metaphysics from the end of

5 *Tobiae Andreae epistola*, p. 1 (unnumbered), in JOHANNES CLAUBERG, *Logica vetus et nova*, Amstelaedami, ex officina elzeviriana 1658 (1st ed. 1654); also in ID., *Opera omnia philosophica*, Amstelodami, ex typographia P. et I. Blaev 1691, p. 767 (unnumbered). His 1647 *Ontosophia*, actually, shows no traces of Cartesian philosophy: cf. SAVINI 2011, pp. 25-27.

6 CLAUBERG 1658, *Tobiae Andreae epistola*, p. 3 (unnumbered); CLAUBERG 1691, p. 767 (unnumbered).

7 Cf. *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae MDLXXV-MDCCCLXXV*, ed. by Willem Nikolaas Du Rieu, Hagae Comitum, apud Martinum Nijhoff 1875, p. 391.

8 CLAUBERG 1664, *Johanni De Raei epistola*, p. 2 (unnumbered); CLAUBERG 1691, *Physica, Johanni De Raei epistola*, pp. 1-2 (unnumbered). The opinion of De Raey on Clauberg's texts can be found among the *Elogia ac iudicia* collected in Clauberg's *Opera*, containing the abstracts of two letters of De Raey to Clauberg. In the first letter, dated 11th of July 1664, De Raey praises his exposition of Descartes's theories, but criticizes Clauberg as having considered rarefaction – like Descartes did – as the cause of the circulation of blood, instead of hypothesizing the existence of a *vis pulsifica*: cf. CLAUBERG 1691, *Elogia ac iudicia*, p. 12 (unnumbered).

1648 until August 1649⁹. Along with Andreae, thus, De Raey is to be considered as one of his most important teachers, to whom Clauberg would submit also his *Paraphrasis in Meditationes* (1658) – as stated in a letter of De Raey included in Clauberg's posthumous *Opera*¹⁰ – and his *Logica vetus et nova* (1654), according to another letter of De Raey, addressed to Christoph Wittich and edited in his *Cogitata de interpretatione* (1692)¹¹. However, the first text of Clauberg De Raey dealt with was his *Defensio cartesiana*.

The *Defensio cartesiana* of Clauberg had a complex background, since the first critiques of Revius are to be traced back to February and March 1647, when he accused Descartes of Pelagianism in some disputation arising the Leiden crisis¹². Subsequently, the theologian Jacob Trigland accused Descartes

9 JOHANNES CLAUBERG, *Physica, quibus rerum corporearum vis et natura, mentis ad corpus relatae proprietates, denique corporis ac mentis arcta et admirabilis in homine coniunctio explicantur*, Amstelodami, apud Danielelem Elzevirium 1664, *Johanni De Raei epistola*, p. 1 (unnumbered); CLAUBERG 1691, *Physica, Johanni De Raei epistola*, p. 1 (unnumbered).

10 Dated 2nd of July 1658, in this letter De Raey praises Clauberg's *Paraphrasis in Renati Descartes Meditationes de prima philosophia* (1658) as adopting new words to convey the very concepts of Descartes: cf. CLAUBERG 1691, *Elogia ac iudicia*, p. 12 (unnumbered).

11 Dated 12th of August 1680, in this letter De Raey outlines the events pulling him to develop his theory concerning the distinction of vulgar and philosophical ways of thinking, aimed against the application of philosophy to theology and medicine and expounded in his *Cogitata*. De Raey writes that Clauberg submitted to him the text of his *Logica*, whose contents were taught by De Raey himself before he realized the importance of the distinction of the two kinds of knowledge, not maintained in Clauberg's novantique logic: cf. JOHANNES DE RAEY, *Cogitata de interpretatione*, Amstelaedami, apud Henricum Wetstenium 1692, pp. 658-659. A textual evidence from De Raey's *Pro vera metaphysica*, moreover, may suggest he could have in mind Clauberg's *Ontosophia* in criticizing Scholastic or vulgar metaphysics: «vulgaris metaphysica [...] pro obiecto assumit ens qua ens, in latissima acceptione sua, qua idem est, quod in communi sermone res dicitur», JOHANNES DE RAEY, *Clavis philosophiae naturalis aristotelico-cartesiana. Editio secunda*, Amstelodami, apud Danielelem Elsevirium 1677, p. 424. The misuse of metaphysical and logical concepts is criticized also in his *Specimen logicae interpretationis* (1669-1671), which deals, however, with the systematization of Franco Burgersdijk (cf. DE RAEY 1692, pp. 540-541). In his *Cogitata* De Raey defines the right meaning of “ens” – and of its main genera – as a second intention (*ibid.*, p. 201). His polemical target, however, is vague.

12 Cf. JACOBUS REVIUS, *Analectorum theologicorum disputatio XXIII. De cognitione Dei, tertia*,

of blasphemy in March of the same year¹³. As Adriaan Heereboord was keeping Descartes informed, the Frenchman answered to these accusations with a defensive letter addressed to the Curators of the University of Leiden in May: nevertheless, a ban on Cartesian philosophy followed later in the same year. Moreover, at the end of the year De Raey himself attacked, during an inflamed disputation, the Aristotelian professor Adam Stuart¹⁴. The controversy went on through all 1648, when Heereboord attacked Revius and Stuart in his *Praefatio* to Descartes's *Notae in programma quoddam*¹⁵, and with the publication of Revius's *Methodi cartesianae consideratio theologica*¹⁶. In the following years, other texts appeared: Revius's *Statera philosophiae cartesianae* (1650) and *Nova Renati Descartes Sapientia* (1651)¹⁷ of Cyriacus Lentulus, professor at the university of Herborn.

Revius's *Consideratio* and *Statera* and Lentulus's *Sapientia* provide the philosophical and theological criticisms to Descartes's method, to be vindicated by Clauberg in his *Defensio*. Revius's *Consideratio* addresses Descartes's method in a broad sense, namely, Descartes's metaphysics as it is presented in

Lugduni Batavorum, apud heredes Johannis Nicolai a Dorp 1647, art. 13. On the Leiden crisis, cf. VERBEEK 1992, pp. 34-51.

13 Cf. JACOBUS TRIGLANDIUS, *Systema disputationum theologiarum in confessionem et apologiam Remonstrantium*, Lugduni Batavorum, ex officina B. et A. Elsevir 1650, p. 50.

14 Cf. ADRIAAN HEEREBOORD, *Selectarum ex philosophia disputationum volumen primum*, Lugduni Batavorum, apud F. Moiardum 1650, *Ad Curatores epistola*, pp. 70-90. Revius's *Statera* was an answer to Heereboord's *Epistola*.

15 Cf. RENÉ DESCARTES, *Oeuvres*, ed. by Charles Adam, Paul Tannery, Paris, Cerf 1897-1913 (hereafter as "AT"), VIII-2, pp. 337-339. Actually, the *Praefatio* was anonymous.

16 JACOBUS REVIUS, *Methodi cartesianae consideratio theologica*, Lugduni Batavorum, apud Hieronymum de Vogel 1648. Cf. AZA GOUDRIAAN, *Jacobus Revius: A Theological Examination of Cartesian Philosophy: Early Criticisms* (1647), Leiden, Brill 2002. In 1648 Revius published another text, not taken into account by Clauberg: JACOBUS REVIUS, *Abstersio macularum quae ab anonymo quodam, calumniosae praefactionis in Notas Cartesianas auctore, ipsi aspersae sunt*, Lugduni Batavorum, apud heredes Johannis Nicolai a Dorp 1648.

17 CYRIACUS LENTULUS, *Nova Renati Des Cartes sapientia: faciliiori quam antehac methodo detecta*, Herbornae Nassoviorum 1651.

the historical narration of his *Discourse de la méthode*. By dividing the method in eight stages – from Descartes's learning and examination of Scholastic knowledge up to the demonstrations of the existence of God – Revius aims to disclose the internal contradictions in Descartes's texts, as well as the inconsistencies with Reformed theology, through a commentary of Descartes's *Discours* and other texts. On the other hand, in his *Statera* Revius follows Heereboord's *Epistola* and is more concerned with the application of the synthetic method of mathematicians to metaphysics and theology, which Descartes carried on in the deductive rearrangement of his *Meditationes* in his answer to Mersenne's objections¹⁸, and to natural philosophy, where he used only hypotheses or false principles, contradicting Descartes's plan of a *pura mathesis*¹⁹. Such criticisms are maintained by Lentulus in his *Sapientia*, mainly concerning Descartes's apparent spurn of Scholastic logic. Lentulus blames Descartes for attempting to apply the method of mathematics to every discipline, with disregard of logic as a means for disputes, which Lentulus represents as a consistent theory of reasoning²⁰.

Eventually, in 1652 only the first part of Clauberg's *Defensio* saw the light. According to Clauberg his text had to be edited in two parts: the first, *exoterica maius*, concerning the Cartesian method or logic, which had to serve as an introduction to the more complex topics of Cartesian philosophy, as those treated in metaphysics. This had to be the object of Clauberg's planned *Defensio acroamatica*, which he never published: still, he devoted to Descartes's metaphysics his *Initiatio philosophi* (1655), likely to be considered as the con-

18 JACOBUS REVIUS, *Statera philosophiae cartesianae*, Lugduni Batavorum, ex officina Petri Lessen 1650, pp. 7-14; cf. AT VII, pp. 160-170.

19 REVIUS 1650, pp. 15-20

20 LENTULUS 1651, pp. 30-31, 50-58, 223-224

tinuation of his *Defensio*, and his *Exercitationes de cognitione Dei et nostri* (1656)²¹. Being a commentary of Descartes's *Discours de la méthode*, or the exoteric introduction to his philosophy, Clauberg's *Defensio* mainly focuses its sections I to III, avoiding any close enquiry on the metaphysical problems treated in section IV, and on Descartes's natural philosophy considered in section V and VI²². In fact, the *Defensio cartesiana* sets the ground for the comprehensive development of Cartesian logic expounded by Clauberg in his *Logica vetus et nova*, where the four rules of the method are integrated in syllogistic reasoning. The unedited letters of De Raey, actually, testify his role in the development of such defence, as well as the close connections between Clauberg and the Leiden Cartesians.

A JOINT DEFENCE

The three handwritten letters of De Raey to Clauberg are to be traced back to 1651, 1652 and 1661²³. The transcription of the first letter sounds as it fol-

21 JOHANNES CLAUBERG, *Initiatio Philosophi, sive dubitatio cartesiana, ad metaphysicam certitudinem viam aperiens*, Lugduni Batavorum, ex officina A. Wyngaerden 1655; ID., *De cognitione Dei et nostri centum exercitationes*, Duisburg, ex officina Wyngaerden 1656.

22 Cf. chapter XXIII: «ad sectionis quintae initium. I. Cum in hac sectione physica tractentur, similes ob causas ad tres Principiorum libros physicos a nobis reservabuntur, ob quas ea quae in antecedente sectione proponuntur, ad Meditationes metaphysicas retulimus», JOHANNES CLAUBERG, *Defensio cartesiana, adversus Iacobum Revium [...] et Cyriacum Lentulum [...]: pars prior exoterica, in qua Renati Cartesii Dissertatio de methodo vindicatur, simul illustria cartesianae logicae et philosophiae specimina exhibentur*, Amstelodami, apud Ludovicum Elzevirium 1652, p. 251; CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1013. Chapters I to XVIII concern the method, or the first three sections of Descartes's *Discours*; chapters XIX to XXI concern Descartes's provisional ethics (section IV), chapter XXII concerns metaphysics (section V), and chapters XIII to XXX concern some paragraphs of sections V and VI, on physics and its method. The other chapters (XXXI to XXXVII) are about various arguments. On Clauberg's *Defensio*, cf. SAVINI 2011, pp. 117-139.

23 The first two letters are preserved at the Leiden University Library (Special Collections

lows:

[1] Amicissime Domine,

[2] Dici non potest quanta laetitia ego pariter atque Dominus Heidanus / affectus fuerim hisce diebus, pertactis gratissimis tuis literis quas prid[ie] Cal[endas] / Aug[usti] ad nos dabas. Probamus consilium vestrum de refutatione Staterae, idq[ue] ut quam/primum [5] exequamini suademus. Vellem mihi significasses qua methodo id efficien/dum censeas, breviterve per notulas vaga hominis vestigia praemendo, an vero uberiori sermone et viva magis methodo praecipuas tantum materias / a cavillis vindicando; quodcumque fiat, margaritae prociendae erunt porcis, / aut permiscendae saltem illorum sterquiliniis. Nosti quam multa conferenda tecum / haberem super hoc negotio, siquidem coram agere inter nos liceret. Cum /[10] Statera primum edita esset, levi cum attentione sed maiori fastidio eam perenni [?], visusque mihi tunc fui methodum aliquam concipere foeliciter ipsam refutandi. / Idque tunc temporis effectum etiam dedissem, nisi privatae rationes quae me et hanc / academiam spectant praecateris, obstitissent. Te vero nihil tale movere potest. / Methodo quidem aliqua sed non nimis accurate opus est. Mihi saltem nihil / magis obstaret in tali negotio, quam quod illustres illos et valde utiles humanae sapientiae thesauros, quos quamplurimos adeo turpiter conspirantes et inique /[15] aestimatos videmus in ista Statera, in tam impuro loco expendere adeoqu[e] non / pro dignitate tractare possem. Sed quid agas? Quando id quod volumus non / quatenus debemus id quod possumus. Sat[is] erit tam impotentis adversarii ferociam / atque auctoritatem non nihil refringi: quod nisi admodum fallor facile etiam praestabis. / Vellem methodum quam praeconcepisti mihi indicares si liceret per otium. Et, si /[20] nemine conscio fieri posset, non inconsultum foret scriptum tuum a me perlegi / priusquam typo mandaretur, non quod tua diffidam scientia, sed quod maiori quam / in aliis solet opus sit prudentia, rerumque multarum quae istos homines communemque / tangunt causam experientiae, quam tantum saltem me habere nosti, ut non/nulla forte quae vel scripta necessaria vel inutilia etiam essent adverterem. /[25] Propter instantias publicas privatasque lectiones, iam mihi multum otii non est. / Versor adhuc in praecognitis meis, quae problematum explicationi (in qua iamdudum / fui) praemitte- re necesse habui, per publicas disput[at]iones typi[s] divulgandas. Ter iam / disputavi: quatuor adminimum restant theses de dictis praecognitis, quas ubi / omnes absolvere non exiguo nec inutili labore defunctus mihi videbor. Sci/re [30] etiam velim num ad metaphysicam multum digredi sit animus. Sufficeret forte / verba Triglandi pag. a citata ex professo expendi: in caeteris autem vestigia / auctoris quantum id per leges methodi licebit sequi. Sed nimis longum foret in / praesentiarum me dimittere in hunc campum. Si grave tibi non fuerit, quam / primum certior fieri velim consiliorum tuorum, atque una scrupulos

(KL), BPL 293: B), the third one is at the Chicago University Library (Special Collections, Manuscripts, Frank Webster Jay Collection, 4816174).

aliquos, qui occur/rent [35] forte in istohoc labore, in literis proximis
consignatis videre; et experieris / reipsa, quam paratus sim non ad eos tantum
pro mea temeritate tibi eximendos sed / in quacunque alia re in posterum tibi
serviendum. Vale et salve cum Wittichio / tuo communi nostro bonaeque
causae amico ab eo qui ut semper fuit ita aeternum erit

Totus vester
Joannes de Raei

aliquae quaest. Theolog. [41] Vide num invenire possis locum Bezae qui in limine
libelli alicuius quo tractatur / in epistola dedicatoria ad Calvinum extat, et si-
gnifica num inveneris: dicitur illic etiam in necessa/riis fidem spectantibus du-
bitandum esse.

Petri Galatini de arcanis cathol. verit. Giphunii

The letter shows an annotation, apparently of Clauberg himself, aside to line
41: «*aliquae quaest. Theolog.*», as well as an additional line – written by the
same hand – below De Raey's postscript, mentioning Petrus Galatinus's *De
arcanis catholicae veritatis* (1518) and the name of the jurist Hubert van Giffen ,
followed by a brief quotation for personal use, whose conditions do not allow
a consistent transcription.

Beneath the letter:

An Hern Fredericus Mercks
tor auf dem Henmendet
in
Coln
Umb uber Siegen
Cito fortzubestellen ad Hern
Johan Clauberg philosophiae
professori celeberrimo
Herbornam

Clarissimo ac Celeberrimo viro
Domino Johanni Claubergio
philosophiae professori excellentissimo

Sent to Herborn, which Clauberg left in December 1651, this letter can be

dated back to August 1651, as it refers to a letter of Clauberg received on 31st of July (lines 3-4). Moreover, it mentions three disputations on Aristotle's *Problemata* (lines 28-29): actually, his first three disputations took place on 3rd and 17th of May, and on 14th of June 1651, according to the front pages of De Raey's disputations.

A brief commentary will make the comprehension of this document easier. The letter focuses on the answer to be given to Revius's *Statera philosophiae cartesianae*, published in late 1650²⁴. At first sight, it is likely that in summer 1651 Clauberg had not written his *Defensio* yet, since, according to De Raey's letter, Clauberg expounded to him his intentions to refute Revius's *Statera* (lines 1-4). This forthcoming answer is urged by De Raey and by the Cartesian theologian Abraham Heidanus (lines 4-5): hence, De Raey asks further information about the method Clauberg want to follow for such confutation (lines 5-7). Whether by following the arguments of Revius with a commentary («per notulas vaga hominis vestigia premendo»), or by discussing the main topics at stake with a more fruitful and brilliant discourse and method («uberiori sermone et viva magis methodo praecipuas materias [...] vindicando»), every refutation of Revius's *Statera* would be a confrontation with obtuse adversaries (lines 7-8), not being any need of a too detailed method to carry on such confutation (line 13). The overtones of the letter, actually, reveal De Raey's sincere contempt for the enemies of Descartes, to be dealt with only to vindicate his master. Still, De Raey reminds Clauberg that he would tell him many things on the refutation of Revius, if only they could talk in person (lines 8-9). In fact, as De Raey declares in lines 9 to 12, he started himself to think about a reply to Revius, being however prevented to carry on this pur-

24 Cf. REVIUS 1650, *Jacobo Triglandio epistola*, p. 2 (unnumbered): the letter is dated «V Kal. Octob.», the book was presumably published shortly thereafter.

pose by some private reasons concerning the university of Leiden (lines 13-16). Beyond any doubt, he refers to the 1647 prohibition of overtly treating Cartesian philosophy, and to the need to avoid any conflict with academic authorities by a direct attack on Revius. Such circumstances, on the other hand, did not affect Clauberg (line 12). In fact, those «illustres [...] et valde utiles humanae sapientiae thesauros, quos quamplurimos adeo turpiter conspirantes et inique aestimatos videmus in ista Statera» could be either Triglandius and other detractors of Descartes mentioned in Revius's *Statera* (since De Raey refers to «istos homines» in line 22), or the very contents of Descartes's philosophy, which are wrongly juxtaposed in order to show their apparent inconsistencies («turpiter conspirantes»), as Revius did all through his *Statera*. De Raey, indeed, could not weigh and treat those personalities or topics, «in tam impuro loco expendere adeoqu[e] non pro dignitate tractare possem», presumably referring to their analysis from a Cartesian point of view, as one can suggest in the light of the title of Revius's book²⁵. In any case, according to De Raey, their first concern had to be with the spurning of Revius's anger and authority, an easy task for Clauberg (lines 17-18).

The following lines reveal the actual cooperation between Clauberg and De Raey in drawing the *Defensio*, since De Raey asks his friend to be kept informed about the method he would choose and, suggesting secrecy («si nemine conscio fieri posset»), to read the proofs in advance (lines 19-21). Such communication, actually, was required by De Raey not because he was doubting Clauberg's competence, but as in such field an extraordinary prudence was required: «quod maiori quam in aliis solet opus sit prudentia». The communication of the proofs of Clauberg's *Defensio*, moreover, was required be-

25 «Statera philosophiae cartesianae, qua principiorum eius falsitas et dogmatum impunitas expenditur ac castigatur».

cause De Raey would like to know some of those arguments (no matter if these were irrelevant or necessary) concerning the theologians and the common cause of Clauberg and De Raey, as these involved De Raey himself, presumably in 1647 (lines 21-22): «quod [...] rerumque multarum quae istos homines communemque tangunt causam experientiae, quam tantum saltem me habere nosti, ut nonnulla forte quae vel scripta necessaria vel inutilia etiam essent adverterem». Indeed, in the following lines De Raey admits to be busy with his private lectures and public duties: above all, with his exacting *Disputationes ad Problemata Aristotelis* (lines 25-29). Therefore, he would not be able to be acquainted with all the contents of the forthcoming *Defensio*. In any case, De Raey would like to know whether Clauberg will pay consistent attention to metaphysics (lines 29-30), and suggests that it would suffice to carefully analyse only the words of Triglandius, apparently quoted in Clauberg's missing letter («verba Triglandi pag. α citata»²⁶), whereas in all the other topics it would be enough to follow the main line of Revius's arguments (lines 31-32). Actually, Clauberg's *Defensio* was not aimed to rebuke Triglandius's criticisms: so far, De Raey's suggestion did not result in the contents of Clauberg's book. Not willing to be lengthy on this matter, De Raey finally recommends Clauberg to keep him informed about his decisions in his next letters, with the due precautions (lines 32-35). In fact, De Raey stresses the importance of the secrecy of their cooperation, as he suggested Clauberg to send the proofs of his *Defensio* without informing anyone else (lines 19-20). Eventually, De Raey's concerns will be more clear in his second handwritten letter. He adds, nevertheless, that he is ready to dismiss such precautions

26 There are no indications to identify De Raey's reference, since the unnumbered pages in Revius's *Statera* do not include any quotation from Triglandius's works. One can suggest, at most, that he was referring to something known by them both, as something yet discussed.

with regard to his friend, as well as to help him in every other matter (lines 35-37).

The last lines of the letter, besides De Raey's greetings to Christoph Wittich, colleague and friend of Clauberg in Herborn (lines 36-37), present more evidence of their cooperation in the refutation of Revius's *Statera*. In his postscript, De Raey draws Clauberg's attention on an *Epistola dedicatoria ad Calvinum* opening a short writing of Theodorus Beza, which De Raey could not accurately remember. In that *Epistola*, Beza recommended the use of doubt even in matters of faiths. Being the accusation of applying doubt to matter of faiths a leitmotif in Revius's works, De Raey found in the words of Calvin's fellow a striking sample of the use of doubt consistent with reformed theology. This passage was found by Clauberg in Beza's *Quaestionum et responsionum christianarum libellus*²⁷ (referred to as «aliquae quaest. Theolog.» in the remark aside to De Raey's postscript), and included in chapter IX of his *Defensio*²⁸. Such chapter concerns doubt as it is firstly faced in the second part of Descartes's *Discours*, in the light of the well known metaphor of the building of knowledge²⁹. Clauberg considers Descartes's effort to eradicate his beliefs

27 THEODORUS BEZA, *Volumen tractationum theologicarum, in quibus pleraque Christianae religionis dogmata adversus haereses nostris temporibus renovatas solide ex verbo Dei defenduntur*, Genevae, anchora Joannis Crispini 1570, pp. 669-307. Cf. Io. C. *epistola*, *ibid.*, p. 669.

28 «Ut autem Revio, Lentulo eorumque sociis Cartesio dubitationem exprobantibus os obturetur, producam locum Theodori Bezae, qui in quaestion. et responsion. christianarum Libelli dedicatio ad Io. C. ita scribit: *causam huic qualicunque scriptioni partim prae-buerunt amici, dum varia ex me percontatur, partim ipsemet de multis dubitando velut accersivi. Etsi enim illa academicorum ἀκαταληψία nostrae persuasioni ex diametro repugnans ex ecclesia prorsus explodenda est, et inanis curiositas valde reprehendenda: in hac tamen humani iudicii imbecillitate iudico, dubitare de rebus necessariis et utilibus non tantum licere, verum etiam oportere, modo eorum similes non simus, quod dicere consuevi semper quaerere ut nunquam inveniant. Si illum de rebus theologicis dubitandi modum in Beza non carpunt, quid in Cartesio de rebus tantum philosophicis simili ratione dubitanti litem movent litigiosi?*», CLAUBERG 1691, p. 972. Italics by Clauberg.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 964; cf. AT VI, p. 546.

and to replace them only with those put through an accurate examination. This effort is defended through the appeal to some authorities, aimed to show the consistency of Cartesian doubt with a moral life³⁰. Since Clauberg appeals to Heereboord, quoted through the *Statera* of Revius³¹ and to Plato, cited in his *Meno*³², Beza is the theological authoritative source on the use of doubt in matters of faith. Moreover, because the fourth part of Descartes's *Discours* – where Descartes considers metaphysical doubt – is barely addressed by Clauberg in chapter XXII of his *Defensio*, mostly concerning the application of geometrical method to metaphysics and the supposed development of a new theology by Descartes³³, De Raey's suggestion becomes the most relevant argument used by Clauberg to demonstrate the consistency of doubt with reformed theology.

VIOLATED LETTERS

The second handwritten letter of De Raey is dated 2nd/12th of November 1652, and sounds as it follows:

30 «Quis nescit, multos esse ecclesiarum pastores, multos theologos, qui in pluribus eiusce-modi naturae tantum lumine dignoscendis controversiis vere scepticos agant, nihil unquam determinantes, semper incerti? Quod si tales viri excusantur [...] ecquis non Cartesium [...] ab omni crimine liberet?», CLAUBERG 1691, p. 972.

31 «Nec Aristotele eiusque interpretes aliud de dubitatione sensisse, egregie docuit Clariss. Heereboortius Disp. *περί ἀπορίας* quae nunc prima est in appendice Disputationum ex philosophia select. volum. primi, quam cum refutare Revius nulla ratione posset, in ista *Statera* pag. 246 eam elevat: mira metamorphosi Cartesium in Aristotelem transformat, et illius dubitationes huic conatur affricare, scilicet Heereboortius», *ibid.*, p. 971, cf. REVIUS 1650, p. 246. Revius refers to HEEREBOORD 1650, p. 376.

32 CLAUBERG 1691, p. 971, cf. PLATO, *Meno*, in *Divini Platonis opera omnia quae extant*, Marsilio Ficino interprete, Genevae, apud Franciscum le Preux 1590, pp. 16-17.

33 CLAUBERG 1691, pp. 1010-1012. The problem of doubt is briefly addressed in § 14 only.

[1] Amicissime Claubergi

[2] Binas a te accepi literas, unam mense sept[embris] alteram octobr[is] datam. Vidi/mus et obiter inspeximus librum Lentuli. Epistola quam addidit plus nocet / quam prodest illius causae. Quod sciam multas unquam literas nummo obsi/gnavi, [5] sed id factum proculdubio fuit a scelestis manibus posteaquam sigillum / meum perfregerant. Pro certo tibi affirmare possum omnes curatores causae / nostrae et philosophiae favere, ne ipsis quidem consulibus, qui hisce diebus electi / et inaugurati sunt, exceptis. Ab inimicis etiam apertis non est quod multum / metuamus: sed quod saepe tibi dixi, et ante eventum praesagivi, eos nempe, / [10] qui extant specie pro amicis habentur, vel imprudenter vel malitiose / causam hanc perdere posse, id quotidiana edoceor experientia. Borno ex/traordinaria philosophiae professio cum stipendio 1000 flor[enis] oblata iam / fuit, sed spargit se conditionem accipere nolle nisi ordinarius creetur: / inter amicos nullum iam explorandae certaeque fidei habeo praeter Heidandum / [15] qui iam aliquoties in aurem mihi dixit, mea solius virtute me promo/veri debere, quod nosti quam arduum sit, cum maiora pluraq[ue] vidi[mu]s [?] / quam virtutibus premia proponi soleant. Scias tamen me magno animo / contra hunc torrentem niti, cum certe fiducia foeliciter tandem et cum / triumpho eluctandi. Doleo tuam et Andreae vicem quod rem habere / [20] cogamini cum tali philosophorum faece. Auctores tibi sumus ut pergas hie-
me / in Acroamaticis: probo consilium de edendo textu cum defensione: / sed
cave tibi a prolixitate. Si coram tecum agerem plura indicare possem. / Passim taedio passim occupationibus laboribusque multis abservitus necdum / inspexi ea quae de Digbaeo et Statera mones. Sed an tam suaves / [25] rosae peragiendae [?] erunt tam impuris facilius porcisq[ue] obiiciendae? / Quatuor singulis diebus habeo collegia. Rev[erendus] Heidanus diu cum gras/sante febre conflictatus fuit. Herebordius nonnihil a letargo suo exci/tatus per Bornaei vocationem in febrem incidit quam lectione libri / Lentuli abegit. De libro Andreae eiusdem tecum sum opinionis. / [30] Obiit Scotanus.

[31]Vale cum C[hris]t[opho]ro Witichio ab eo qui / totus vester est Joannes de Raei

[32]Raptissime 2/12 Nov[embris] 1652

Lugd[uni] Batav[orum]

Beneath the letter:

Viro Clarissimo
Celeberrimoque
Domino Joanni Claubergio
Philosophiae ac Theologiae

Professori dignissimo
tot
Duisborg an de Roer

This letter is in reply to two letters of Clauberg of September and October 1652 (line 2) and was written after the publication of the second main text addressed in Clauberg's *Defensio*, the *Nova Renati Descartes sapientia* of Cyriacus Lentulus, published in Herborn in 1651, as well as after Clauberg's *Defensio*³⁴. In this letter De Raey addresses some circumstances related to the publication of Lentulus's book. After declaring to have examined the book (lines 2-3), De Raey adds that the *Epistola* Lentulus attached to it – undoubtedly, his *Dedicatio curatoribus ac directoribus Academiæ Lugdunensis et Ultraiectina*³⁵ – would be detrimental to his own cause (lines 3-4). De Raey declares that his own correspondence had been violated: presumably referring to a previous letter of Clauberg, De Raey declares that he had never sealed his letters with a coin: this had been done by someone who broke the original seal (lines 4-6).

These lines can reveal the occasion of the publication of Lentulus's *Sapientia*, if compared with the very text of his *Dedicatio*. In such text, Lentulus mentions the diffusion of the “Cartesian poison” in Germany³⁶. As Clauberg was teaching in Herborn since the end of 1649, apparently without any problem, Lentulus seems to refer to a forthcoming overrun of the controversy on Cartesianism to Herborn: which would explode with the publication of

34 The *Praefatio* of Clauberg's *Defensio* is dated February 1652: CLAUBERG 1691, p. 941.

35 LENTULUS 1651, pp. 3-10.

36 «Renatum dico Des Cartes [...] Sententiarum eius peregrinantem adeo contempseram, apud Batavos cum degerem, ut ne paginam quidem liberorum contra eum scriptorum legere dignarer. Peregre deinde agens, de fama eius nihil audivi, nec inquirere curavi. Postquam vero e Gallia Narbonensi ab Illustrissimo Comite Nassoviae ad docendam politicam et historiarum usum Herbornam evocatus, Lugduni etiam turbatum esse cum indignatione percepi, et virus illud ulterius serpere, et venas Germaniae tentare animadverti», *ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

Clauberg's *Defensio*. This forthcoming publication, in fact, seems to have been foreseen by Lentulus through the violation of De Raey's correspondence. This can explain the urgency of Lentulus's writing, assessed in his *Dedicatio*, as well as the encouragement of his friends (probably, those of Leiden)³⁷. Indeed, Lentulus wrote his *Sapientia*, a bulk of commented quotations from Descartes's works (whereas Revius's *Statera* has a more consistent structure), in few weeks. De Raey himself, moreover, describes its appearance as something unexpected, «ante eventum» (line 9), precipitating the clash over Cartesian philosophy. As can be presumed from De Raey's words, the violation of his correspondence took place in Leiden, where he had some ambiguous friends, even if University Curators and city authorities (to which he would dedicate his *Clavis*) were supporting him (lines 6-8). Clauberg wrote his *Defensio*, as declared in the *Praefatio*, in order to answer to the accusations of Lentulus, who attacked him apparently without any reason³⁸, and under the suggestion of some friend of him³⁹. On the other hand, in his *Thekel hoc est levitas Defensionis cartesianae* (1653) Revius will accuse Clauberg for having been pulled by Leiden Cartesians to write his *Defensio*, since they could not

37 «Seposita meliorum meditationum cura, in castra Cartesii speculatum transii, animum-que simul cepi ac operae iudicavi, cursoria functione quid sentirem de famosi authoris opinionibus, chartae illinere. Quod paucarum septimanarum praecipitata scriptitandi opera factum. Cum vero moecenatibus meis et amicis visa essent non indigna luce, quanquam apud Batavos meliora aut edita esse aut edi posse credebam, ut qui et scribendi acumine pollerent, et hunc conflictum iam non novum haberent; cessi tamen in eorum, quibus negare nihil poteram, benevolam coactionem et pro veritate protegenda vel periculum famae subii. Famae vel a scribendi festinatione, vel ab adversariorum solita invehendi petulantia et obtrectandi libidine denigrandae», *ibid.*, pp. 8-9.

38 «Herbornae philosophiam tranquille docebam, cum Cyriacus Lentulus successibus invidens, professoribus plerisque insciis, librum prelo daret, hunc prae se ferentem titulum: *Nova Renati des Cartes sapientia* [...]. Me vero iam sub discipuli cartesiani, iam sub sectatoris Cartesii aliisque appellationibus, iam sub initialibus nominis mei et cognominis literis I. CL. immerito vellicatum esse deprehendo», CLAUBERG 1691, p. 939.

39 «Opportune igitur hortabantur amici atque instabant, ut eadem opera ab insultibus Iacobi Revii [...] philosophiam nostram liberarem», *ibid.*

attack Revius directly. This had been communicated to him in a letter of October 1651, before the appearance of Clauberg's *Defensio*⁴⁰. The contents of the two letters by De Raey demonstrate that Revius was somehow right, because it is true that De Raey urged Clauberg to answer Revius since he could not personally do this. Aware of this fact, Revius and Lentulus anticipated the publication of Clauberg's *Defensio* with the *Sapientia*. Also for this reason, De Raey suspected that his correspondence had been opened «a scelestis manibus». Already in his first letter De Raey recommended Clauberg to be cautious in communicating his thoughts. Whether De Raey's suspicions were valid or not, they testify the acrimony characterizing the debates on Cartesianism in the early 1650s.

From line 11, the letter concerns the criticisms to Revius and Lentulus, as well as some affairs related to Leiden University. De Raey announces that Henricus Bornius has become extraordinary professor⁴¹, and confirms his trust in Abraham Heidanus, his most faithful friend in Leiden, who revealed to De Raey his wish to have him appointed (lines 11-16). In fact, at that time De Raey did not have an official position in Leiden yet, being only allowed to

40 «Id fortasse coniciet e verbis ad me Herborna prescriptis Kal. Nov. 1651 ita autem habent: *philosophi cartesiani* SCENAE AD TEMPUS INSERVIRE (*haec enim sunt illorum verba*) LUGDUNI decreverunt. *Claubergium nostrum*, VESTRI rogant, *ut vel refutationem Revii, vel Lentuli urgeat*: AB IPSIS ENIM HOC NON DEBERE», JACOBUS REVIUS, *Thekel, hoc est levitas Defensionis cartesianae, quam Iohannes Claubergius Considerationi et Staterae Iacobi Revii opposuit*, Brielaë, Michael Feermans 1653, *In praefationem Claubergii*, pp. 2-3 (unnumbered). One can find an account of these reciprocal accusations, among the reasons of the publication of Lentulus's *Sapientia* and Clauberg's *Defensio*, in MASSIMILIANO SAVINI, *Le développement de la méthode cartésienne dans les Provinces-Unies (1643-1665)*, Lecce: Conte 2004, pp. 164-170; SAVINI 2011, pp. 117-119.

41 This is stated in the *Resoluties van Curatoren* of 1652. He was entitled as *professor philosophiae extraordinarius* on 30th of August 1652 (when the Curators allowed De Raey to continue his public lecturing), and called to teaching on 20th of October: cf. MOLHUYSEN 1918, pp. 68-69. He became *professor ordinarius* – as he wished, according to De Raey's letter (line 13) – on 29th of October 1653 (MOLHUYSEN 1918, p. 71). Bornius lectured on ethics and De Raey on physics: *ibid.*, p. 76.

lecture on Aristotle's *Problemata*. He would become extraordinary professor only in 1653⁴². This explains his complaints on the difficulties in obtaining an official position, even if he was sure to finally succeed (line 16-19). After this digression, De Raey focuses on the polemics on Cartesianism again, by mentioning Tobias Andreae, who had been working on his reply to Revius's *Consideratio* since 1651, namely, his *Methodi cartesianae assertio*, to be published in 1653 and 1654⁴³. De Raey complains that Clauberg and Andreae have to deal with the scum of philosophers (lines 19-20): still, he suggests Clauberg to keep in writing the esoteric part of his *Defensio*, to be edited along with the first one (lines 20-21). The esoteric part, nevertheless, was never published. In any case, De Raey recommends Clauberg not to be lengthy (line 22): just as in his first letter, the Dutchman suggests to Clauberg not to devote too much

42 Cf. the *Resoluties van Curatoren* of Leiden University of 9th of February 1651, stating that De Raey could not use the title of “professor” (*ibid.*, p. 54), and of 10th of June 1653, stating his appointment as *professor philosophiae extraordinarius*, on a salary of 500 guildens (*ibid.*, p. 76).

43 TOBIAS ANDREAE, *Methodi cartesianae assertio, opposita Jacobi Revii Methodi cartesianae considerationi theologiae*, Groningae Frisorum, typis Joannis Cölleni 1653; ID., *Pars secunda Assertionis methodi primaeque philosophiae cartesianae*, Groningae Frisorum, typis Joannis Cölleni 1654. Cf. first part, *Praefatio*, pp. 58-59: «relicta igitur Clariss. Dn. Claubergio refutatione Statera, cui iam se accingisse intelligebam, Considerationem theologicam, si Dis placet, contra ea, quae vel maxime arroduntur in Methodo et Meditationibus directam, mihi convellendam sumpsi, et quidem re etiamnum Herbornae servente, mense septembri anni MDCLII, inter exordia lectionum et exercitorum academicorum, cum anno novo academico non resumptorum, omnia quae eo spectarent κατὰ πόδα persecutus, in chartam conieci. Nec tamen ad editionem festinavi, partim quod natura cunctantior in talibus, et genio a scribendis libris et in publico famae theatro me iactandi alienus, partim quod occupationes ordinariae ocium non concederem nitide describendi aut ad praelum parandi concepta, nec quae festinanter admodum scripsissem, mente manum praecurrendo incitante, assequi legendo posset amanuensis meus; partim etiam quod mox resciscerem Herbornae eam causam iam conclamatam, et istos amicos meos, veritatis athletas, pro quibus satagebam, thuiscopyregensem vocationem secutos, iam eo commigrasse: mihi vero sufficeret interim optima conscientia, suo tempore cum veritate, temporis filia, satis omnibus eiusmodi opprobriis et contumeliis, liberanda, publiceque vindicanda». Andreae refers to the departure of Clauberg and Wittich from Herborn to Duisburg, at the end of 1651. On Andreae's *Assertio*, cf. SAVINI 2011, pp. 139-160.

zeal to the refutation of the criticisms to Descartes, and points out that he would tell him more if only they could meet (line 22). In fact, De Raey provides Clauberg only with the most general and necessary information: presumably, because of his worries regarding the secrecy of their cooperation, stressed also in the first letter.

A further similarity with the first letter is to be noticed in lines 22-25. Complaining his lack of time, De Raey informs his friend that he could not look at the note on Digby and Revius's *Statera*: however, paying efforts to such matters would be like casting pearls before swine (lines 23-25⁴⁴). Actually, Revius quotes Kenelm Digby's *Observations upon Religio medici* (1643) and *Two treatises* (1644)⁴⁵ in his *Statera*, in order to underline Descartes's merits for mathematics and his errors in metaphysics and theology⁴⁶, and to criticize his explication of the motion of the heart (because Digby is in favour of the *vis pulsifica*)⁴⁷ as well as his account of sense perception⁴⁸. Even if there are no direct means to identify the precise meaning of De Raey's remark, because the letters of Clauberg to De Raey are missing, another letter turns out to be of some help in interpreting this allusion to Digby. This letter, dated to 1664, is included in the *Elogia ac iudicia* of Clauberg's *Opera* and reports the opinion of De Raey on Clauberg's *Theoria corporum viventium* and *Corporis et animae co-*

44 Line 25 presents some difficulties in reading, as the sheet had been folded along it.

45 KENELM DIGBY, *Observations vpon Religio medici*, London, printed by R. C. for Daniel Frere 1643; ID., *Two treatises. In the one of which: the nature of bodies; in the other: the nature of mans soule; is looked into: in way of discovery, of the immortality of reasonable soules*, at Paris, printed by Gilles Blaisot 1644.

46 REVIUS 1650, pp. 9-10, quoting DIGBY 1644, «variis in locis», DIGBY 1643, p. 9.

47 REVIUS 1650, pp. 151-154, quoting DIGBY 1644, p. 233.

48 REVIUS 1650, pp. 160-165, quoting DIGBY 1644, pp. 277, 281. Clauberg will criticize the wanton use of the theories of followers and disciples in interpreting someone's texts, as those of Descartes: cf. his *Logica vetus et nova*, pars III, ch. XI, in CLAUBERG 1691, p. 859-860. Cf. STRAZZONI 2013, p. 143.

*niunctio*⁴⁹. Since De Raey criticizes, in this letter, Descartes's explanation of the motion of the heart, rejecting Harvey's *vis pulsifica* – which De Raey traces back to the muscular constitution of the heart – it seems plausible that this is the topic referred to by De Raey in his handwritten letter.

In finishing with his missive, De Raey informs Clauberg of some recent facts concerning his colleagues in Leiden: the illness of Heidanus, the death of the professor of law Bernardus Schotanus (lines 26-27, 30), and the positive reaction of Heereboord to Bornius's promotion, «a letargo suo excitatus», as well as whose fever, from which he recovered by reading Lentulus's *Sapientia* (lines 27-29). Clearly, De Raey refers to Heereboord's mental and bodily weakness, which impeded him to carry on academic duties since 1652⁵⁰. A last remark is for Andreae, on whose *Assertio* De Raey declares that he agrees with Clauberg (line 29): still, no information is available to put light on their opinion on the book. Like in his first letter, De Raey extends his greetings to Wittich (lines 31-32), who followed Clauberg to Duisburg and is to be considered as directly involved in the circle of Leiden Cartesians.

These two letters of De Raey testify the existence of a common, steady strategy in rebuking the critiques to Descartes's philosophy. Moreover, they allow the identification of those *amici* pulling Clauberg to attack Revius's *Consideratio* and *Statera*, namely, those Leiden Cartesians blamed by Revius in his *Thekel*: De Raey and Heidanus, whereas Heereboord seems not to have been directly involved. Wittich and Andreae also are attested by the letters as cooperating in the defence of Cartesian philosophy. Finally, the overtones of

49 «Non sine ratione dubitavi a multis annis, an hoc tempore sic recte dicatur pulsus cordis a sola sanguinis rarefactione pendere, uti id suo tempore dixit Cartesius: in oppositione ad facultatem pulsificam. Nam valde credibile est, cor etiam instar musculi moveri», CLAUBERG 1691, p. XII (unnumbered), *Elogia ac iudicia*. Cf. *supra*, n. 8.

50 Cf. MOLHUYSEN 1918, p. 60.

De Raey's letters and his cautious approach in keeping his contacts with Clauberg testify the highly critical phase of the debate on Cartesianism involving Leiden and Herborn universities. No evidences on their contacts and cooperation, actually, had to be left to Revius, Lentulus and to the other adversaries of Cartesian philosophy.

PASSING CRISES

Some radical differences can be noticed between these two letters and a third, preserved epistle of De Raey. Written on 3rd of May 1661, it only concerns academic affairs, being a recommendation letter for Clauberg to hire their common friend Petrus Hartzingius as professor of medicine and mathematics in Duisburg:

[1]Amicissime Domine

[2]cum nuper ad te scripseram epistolam illud, quo rogo an missam ante / plures septimanas acceperis pecuniam, invisebat me et amicos communes / alios, noster Hartzingius. Intellexi ab illo quid cogitetis de professi/one [5] mathematica. Quae valde probo et laudo. Propositum suum / et interiores cogitationes mihi aperuit, rogavitq[ue] ut consilio ipsum / iuvarem. Amstelodami nactus est occasionem optimam multum in / praxi medica proficiendi. Consilium igitur meum est quod probat / D. Hartzingius, ut a vestrae Academiae Curatoribus Matheseos et / [10] Med[icinae] prof[essor] designetur et vocetur: sed ea lege ut Amstelo/dami adhuc aliquo tempore liceat commorari. Si plures nomi/nari debeant, superfluunt duo illius amici intimi vobis noti. / Sed Hartzingius multa habet propter quae praeferri possit. / Vale et salve plurimum ab eo qui tibi tuique est addictissimus

J[ohanne]s de Raei

[15]Dabam Lugd[uni] Bat[avorum]

1661 3 Maji

Beneath the letter:

Mijn Heer
Mijn Heer Johannes Claubegius
SS. Theologiae en philos.
Doct. en prof.

Duisburg. Post.

No anger appears from the letter; moreover, no references to Wittich or to other Cartesians can be noticed. This testifies the mere private character of the letter. Such private character is also confirmed by its concerning some money sent by De Raey to Clauberg (lines 2-3). The rest of the letter is about Hartzingius, who visited De Raey and some of their common friends. In their meeting, Hartzingius informed De Raey about Clauberg's opinion on a professorship in mathematics at Duisburg University, and about his will to obtain it (lines 3-5). Hartzingius being skilled in medicine, De Raey suggests Clauberg to call him, through University Curators, as professor of mathematics and medicine, still allowing him to stay for some time in Amsterdam (lines 8-11). Also, De Raey recommends to Clauberg two unnamed friends of Hartzingius, if more positions would be opened in Duisburg. In any case, according to De Raey, Hartzingius was to be highly preferred for an appointment (lines 11-13).

This letter, besides testifying the more quiet milieu in which the communication took place, has some relevance in putting light on the life of Petrus Hartzingius. Born in Japan in 1633 or 1637 as the son of a trader from Antwerp and a Japanese woman, this young mathematician has been in a histori-

ographical querelle⁵¹, since he was reputed to have influenced Japanese mathematical thought in seventeenth and eighteenth century. However, more recent studies⁵² have shown that Hartzingius, even if born in Japan, had no further connections with this country, ending his days in Germany as a mining specialist. Some evidence can be collected on Hartzingius's *cursus studiorum*. The *Album studiosorum* of Leiden University lists three matriculation dates for Petrus Hartzingius Japonensis: on 29th of August 1654 as a 20 years old student of philosophy, on 28th August 1660 as a 22 years old student of medicine, and on 6th of May 1669 as a 31 years old student of medicine, *honoris causa*, this apparently being an honorary nomination as *studiosus*⁵³. Moreover, one can find the matriculation date of Hartzingius in the *Album studiosorum* of Duisburg University: «Petrus Hartzingius, Japonensis, anno aetatis 18. Accessit ex acad. Leidensi et nomen professus 1 Novembris, operam dedit hactenus mathesi, nunc dabit metaphysicae et physicae»⁵⁴. No official records about his graduations in arts and medicine, however, can be found. In any case, his being extremely skilled in mathematics is beyond any doubt: as he was praised by Frans van Schooten in his *Tractatus de concinnandis demonstrationibus geometricis ex calculo algebraico* (1661)⁵⁵. The name of Hartzingius, furthermore, can be

51 The whole history can be found in ALBRECHT HEEFFER, *Dutch Algebra and Arithmetic in Japan before the Meiji Restoration*, online publication, <http://logica.ugent.be/centrum/pre-prints/DutchArithmeticJapan.pdf> (last accessed on 30th of September 2013).

52 PETER VAN DER PAS, *Japanese Students of Mathematics at the University of Leiden during the Sakoku Period*, «Janus» 61, (1974), pp. 271-279; IWAŌ SEIICHI, *The life of Pieter Hartsinck, The Japanner (1637-1680) 'Grand-pupil' of Descartes*, «Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan» 20, 1985, pp. 145-167; ANDREAS BAUMANN, *Petrus Hartsingius Japonensis, A Critical Biography*, «Daigakuin Ronshu» 10, 1991, pp. 31-43.

53 Cf. *Album studiosorum Academiae Lugduno Batavae*, pp. 438, 483, 554.

54 Cf. *Duisburger Universitätsmatrikel 1652-1818*, Neuausgabe, 2. Edition Oktober 2004, due-publico.uni-duisburg-essen.de/servlets/DocumentServlet?id=20541, reprising the *Album Studiosorum Universitatis Duisburgensis* (ms.). Information on Hartzingius can be found at sheet 19 of the manuscript.

55 Cf. FRANS VAN SCHOOTEN, *Tractatus de concinnandis demonstrationibus geometricis ex calculo algebraico*, Amstelaedami, apud Ludovicum et Danielelem Elzevirios 1661, pp. 413-414.

found among the *Elogia ac iudicia* in Clauberg's *Opera omnia*, where he commends Clauberg's *Paraphrasis in Renati Descartes Meditationes de prima philosophia* (1658)⁵⁶. Hartzingius seems thus to have been highly appreciated at his time: this is confirmed by De Raey's recommendation, which concerns an appointment for a professorship in medicine and mathematics, apparently just after his graduation in medicine. Nonetheless, he did not to obtain such position: as he started to work with a mining company, he entered at the service of the Duke of Brunswick-Lüneburg and died in Germany in 1680. The reasons of the missing of his appointment are unknown: having been Clauberg the rector of Duisburg University when the former School finally gained the Academic status in 1655, however, he could not guarantee Hartzingius's hiring.

HIDDEN INFLUENCES

The letters of De Raey offer substantial evidences on the involvement of De Raey in the development of Clauberg's *Defensio* and on the existence of a Cartesian network involving Dutch and German academies. In fact, these letters raise the problem of the actual influence of De Raey on the arguments of Clauberg's *Defensio*, and, by consequence, of the role of De Raey as his mentor. Such influence can be evaluated in the light of some similarities and crypto-quotations to De Raey's *Disputationes* and *Clavis* in Clauberg's *Defensio*,

⁵⁶ «Petrus Hartzingius Leida mense Aprili 1658: Paraphrasin tuam, ut par est, multi magni adstimunt et in coelum evehunt, multi dolent, quod tuum stylum Cartesii textu distinxeris; provectiones autem nexum et evidentiam rationem nonnihil prolixitate interrumpi quaeruntur; gratissimo tamen et lubentissimo ab omnibus, quos quidem ego novi, animo excipitur», CLAUBERG 1691, p. XII (unnumbered), *Elogia ac iudicia*.

whose missing reference can be explained in the light of the first two handwritten letters of De Raey. As Clauberg's *Defensio* was first published in 1652, before De Raey's *Clavis* (1654) but in the same months of his *Disputationes ad Problemata Aristotelis* (1651-1652), De Raey's *Clavis* is explicitly mentioned only in the posthumous edition of Clauberg's book, published in his 1691 *Opera omnia* by Theodor Schalbruch, who could examine the notes Clauberg added to the first editions of his books⁵⁷. Crypto-references and similarities, however, can be found in the 1652 edition of Clauberg's *Defensio*, in chapter XXXII to XXXIV, based on a series of four disputations concerning the causes of childish prejudices held by Clauberg in 1650 and 1651. The texts of such disputations, with the exception of the first one, are missing⁵⁸. The first disputation, moreover, was not included in Clauberg's *Defensio*, whose 1652 edition is thus the earliest document at our disposal.

Chapter XXXII of Clauberg's *Defensio* bears the title *De causis imperfectionum humanae mentis in rebus cognoscendis. De infantiae praeiudiciis dissertatio philosophica prima generalis*, and embodies two similarities with De Raey's *Oratio inauguralis de gradibus et vitiis notitiae vulgaris* and *Disputatio de praecognitis*, held on 25th of March and 3rd of May 1651 and included in De Raey's

57 Cf. CLAUBERG 1691, *Epistola typographi*.

58 JOHANNES CLAUBERG (*praes.*), JOHANNES-FRIEDRICH POSTHIUS (*resp.*), *De causis imperfectionum humanae mentis in rebus cognoscendis prima*, Herbornae Nassoviorum, Johann-Georg Mudersbach 1650. The text of this disputation can be found, with some variants, as the chapter I of the *Prolegomena* of Clauberg's *Logica vetus et nova* (2nd ed., 1658). Also the title of another disputation could be found; its text, however, seems to be missing: JOHANNES CLAUBERG (*praes.*), ISACCUS ENGEL (*resp.*), *Disputationum philosophicarum de causis imperfectionum mentis humanae in rebus cognoscendis quarta, de praeiudiciis infantiae tertia. In qua errores aliquot in cognoscendo et colendo Deo commissi, quatenus a praeiudiciis procedunt, deteguntur ac refutantur*, Herborn 1651. Cf. FRANCESCO TREVISANI, *Descartes in Germania. La ricezione del cartesianesimo nella Facoltà filosofica e medica di Duisburg (1652-1703)*, Milano, Franco Angeli 1992, pp. 53-58.

1654 *Clavis*⁵⁹. The reference to De Raey's *De praecognitiis* is made explicit in 1691 *Opera omnia* of Clauberg, and concerns the acquaintance of immaterial entities, like angels, through sensations as their signs⁶⁰. The consideration of sense data as signs, indeed, can be found also in De Raey's texts, where they are considered as signs of the actual modifications of extended substance, which can be properly conceived, however, only by mind alone⁶¹. The second similarity is to De Raey's *Oratio*. Since it is never made explicit by Clauberg, a parallel comparison may ease its acknowledgment:

«Etiam antiquae Ecclesiae patres non pauci, quorum e numero Lactantius imprimis fuit, praeiudicium de terrae planitie mordicus adeo tenuerunt, ut antipodas dari, id est, homines qui a contraria parte terrae adversa pedibus nostris calcent vestigia, et fabulo-

«Notum est, quot seculis ante detectum novum orbem terram esse planam nullosque habere antipodas creditum fuerit, atque tam pertinaciter ex sensuum praeiudiciis assertum, ut et ineptum, et ridiculum et fabulosum esse putaverint contrarium asserere. Et ut alii sen-

59 JOHANNES DE RAEY, *Oratio inauguralis de gradibus et vitiis notitiae vulgaris circa contemplat. naturae et officio philosophi circa eandem*, Lugduni Batavorum, ex officina Francisci Hackii 1651; ID., (praes.), CASPARUS TER HAAR (resp.), *Disputationum physicarum ad problemata Aristotelis prima, de praecognitis in genere*, Lugduni Batavorum, e typographeo Francisci Hackii 1651, edited respectively at pp. 1-34 and 35-46 of DE RAEY 1654. The dates of De Raey's *Oratio* and disputations are provided in their front pages.

60 «47. Quoniam etiam a teneris de nulla re cogitare solebamus, nisi quae corporea sensuum organa prius movisset atque affecisset, *philosophi decantatum illud invenerunt*: nihil esse in intellectu quin prius fuerit in sensu. Hoc eo facilius fidem meruit, quod [...] ab infantiae praeiudiciis habemus, ut per similitudinem aut absentiam rei sub sensum cadentis quaelibet alia concipiamus. 48. Ac licet effatum suum postea falsum esse deprenderent, cum ad Deum animamque rationalem et similia sensum non afficientia mentem converterent, tamen ob inveteratam ita sentiendi consuetudinem malebant distinctiones mille excogitare, quam noxium axioma, in solis infantiae praeiudiciis fundatum, deserre: nempe ut illud etiam in sensu fuisse diceretur, cuius effectus, aut signum aut oppositum et c. in sensu fuit, quasi quia videre coelum dicor, iccirco Deum oculis videam, aut quia vox illa, angelus, aurem ferit, angelus in aure fuisse debeat putari, aut quia lucem conspicio, etiam tenebras cernam. *Conf. De Raei Clavis philos. natur. cap. de praecogn. seu princip. in genere*, § 2», CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1055: italics denotes a new insertion in respect to the edition of 1652: cf. CLAUBERG 1652, pp. 406-407.

61 DE RAEY 1654, pp. 35-36; cf. ID., *Disputatio de praecognitis*, § 2.

sum et stultum esse pronunciant. Imo refert Aventinus, lib. 3. Histor. Bavar. Virgilium quendam, virum eruditum, et Episcopum Salaeburgensem, quod homines undique terrae globo circumfundi et conversis sive adversis inter se pedibus stare asseruisset, excommunicationis fulmen evitare haud potuisse. Zacharias enim pontifex ad Bonifacium Archiepiscopum, qui virum philosophum detulerat, scripsit, ut Virgilium, tanquam haereticum ab Ecclesia depelleret sacerdotioque deiiceret, nisi perver- sam doctrinam missam facere vellet. Tanta praeiudiciorum vis?», CLAUBERG 1652, p. 402; cf. CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1053.

suum errores, quibus per omnem aetatem assuescimus, ita hic etiam non imperitae tantum plebis, sed doctiorum etiam animos occupavit. Cumque rationibus stabiliri non posset terram nullos habere antipodas, vi ac consequentiis ex theologia petitis actum fuit, dictumque quod antipodibus inductis in terrarum orbem alius etiam induceretur Christus. Sic Virgilius Episcopus Salaeburgensis, qui pro concione huic errori contradixerat, a Bonifacio Episcopo Moguntino crimine impietatis accusatus, literisque a Zacharia pontifice impetratis damnatus sacerdotioque deiectus fuit. Tanta videlicet praeiudiciorum vis est», DE RAEY, *Oratio inauguralis de gradibus et vitiis notitiae vulgaris*, p. 21; cf. DE RAEY 1654, p. 23.

Other similarities between De Raey's and Clauberg's texts are to be found in the following chapter of Clauberg's *Defensio: De praeiudiciis infantiae dissertatio secunda, in qua universae physicae fundamentum ponitur, dum vera sententia de natura seu essentia rei corporeae a praeiudiciis vindicatur*. Like the previous and the following chapters, this also seems to be based on an academic disputation, which took place in Herborn in 1650 or 1651 and whose text and title are lost. The chapter contains Clauberg's critique to the Scholastic notion of material substance, conceived as something different from extension. Therefore, this is regarded as an accident: hence, Scholastics are considered by Clauberg like the dog of Aesop, as they cannot acknowledge the essence of material substance. Such argument and reference to the fable is present in De Raey's *Disputatio de natura materiae* (held on 17th of May 1651) and in the chapter *De*

natura corporis seu materiae of his *Clavis*⁶², which is openly mentioned by Clauberg in his posthumous *Defensio*⁶³. If in this case there is an explicit, even if posthumous, reference to De Raey, one can find other similarities with De Raey's works in chapter XXXIII of Clauberg's *Defensio*, being these never declared by Clauberg. These are with De Raey's *Oratio inauguralis de gradibus et vitiis notitiae vulgaris*, *Disputatio de natura materiae*, and *Clavis*. The source of these analogies seems to be §§ 4-5 of second part of Descartes's *Principia philosophiae*, concerning the notion of matter, the distinction of substance and extension, and the apparent rarefaction of bodies. The first of them concerns the notion of matter as this is defined as *longa, lata ac profunda*:

«Qualis vero extensio? In longum, latum et profundum, quam ex fluxu superficiei provenire cogitat geometra. Neque alia extensio sub cogitationem humanam [sic] cadit praeter eam quae in longitudine, latitudine et profunditate consistit», CLAUBERG 1652, p. 457, cf. CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1070; DESCARTES, *Principia philosophiae*, II, § 4.

«Hanc vero materiam nihil aliud esse quam rem extensam, imo ipsammet illam indefinitam extensionem, quae in particularibus corporibus, certa quantitate, longitudine, latitudine et crassitie determinatur, certaue circumscribitur figura, per se manifestum est; [...] *manifestum est, nudam et solam in longum, latum ac profundum extensionem, totam materiae substantiam, quae Aristoteli ὁ ὄγκος καὶ τὸ σῶμα moles seu corpus dicitur, constituere*», DE RAEY 1654, pp. 53-54, § 8; cf. ID., *Disputatio de natura materiae*, ch. IX; ARISTOTLE,

62 Cf. DE RAEY 1654, pp. 54-55, § 9. Cf. ID. (*praes.*), PETRUS VAN STAVEREN (*resp.*), *Disputatio- num physicarum ad problemata Aristotelis secunda de natura materiae*, Lugduni Batavorum, e typographeo Francisci Hackii 1651, § 10.

63 «Dicam quod res est: habent verum substantiae corporeae conceptum, quo extensionem apprehendunt, sed eam deserunt tanquam ignobile accidens (nam qualitates multoque magis formas substantiales quantitati praeferunt) *stabilius* aliud et solidius et essenziale magis [...] expetentes, similes cani aesopico, qui carnem ore ferebat; sed umbram captans non modo nihil novi acquisivist, verum etiam illud quod habebat perdidit. *Vid. De Raei Clav. phil. natur. cap. de natura corporis art. IX*», CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1070; italics denotes a new insertion in respect to the edition of 1652: cf. CLAUBERG 1652, p. 460.

Physica, IV, 8, 216b 4-12. Italics denotes a new insertion in respect to De Raey's 1651 *Disputatio de natura materiae*.

Another similarity concerns the acquaintance of the essence of the body through abstraction, whose use is suggested both by Clauberg and by De Raey in his *Disputatio de natura materiae*:

«Quid ergo remanet prae caeteris positivi atque absoluti? Extensio: extensio est quae essentiam corporis constituit, quae sola a corpore divelli nequit», CLAUBERG 1652, p. 457.

«Motus abest, figura, situs, locus, magnitudo, ablata sunt raritas, densitas, longitudo, latitudo, profunditas, denique omnia desunt quae a Deo materiali substantiae fuerunt attributa [...] quid concipiant? [...] si aliquid est, praeter confusum substantiae incoporeae conceptum [...] nihil esse potest», *ibid.*, p. 460; cf. CLAUBERG 1691, pp. 1069-1070; DESCARTES, *Principia philosophiae*, II, § 4.

«si haec non esset substantia, quae alia esset, fugeret nos. Demp̄tis enim (hoc est, revera separatis, aut cogitatione saltem sepositis) caeteris [...] nihil aliud remanere videtur, praeter materiem nempe, quae formis illis et accidentibus, quae tolli ab ea possunt, subiecta est», DE RAEY 1654, p. 53, cf. ID. *Disputatio de natura materiae*, § 9; italics denotes a quotation from ARISTOTLE, *Metaphysica*, VII, 3, 1029a 10-12.

«Quid vero tandem est, quod nec quid, nec quale, nec quantum est [...]. Quae absoluta et positiva eius essentia est? si primae aetatis praeiudicia ac errores vulgi consulamus, pro nihilo id habebimus. Tolle enim a corporibus duritiem, gravitatem, calorem, colorem, similiaque sensibilia accidentia, et experire, annon pueri et multi etiam maturae aetatis homines iudicaturi sint, istis sublati, nihil superesse», DE RAEY 1654, p. 52, cf. ID. *Disputatio de natura materiae*, § 8.

The next similarity stands on the use of another metaphor from Aesop's

fables, and concerns De Raey's *Oratio*:

«Sed adhuc videtur nominibus conceptus ille corporis nimis esse mathematicus, nimis abstractus, vellent physicum quid magis reale et substantiale. [...] Quid ergo restat nisi ut manus dent adversarii, et extensionem pro vera corporis essentia agnoscant? Putantne, sicut vulpes elusa a ciconia, se lambere vas vitreum, pul-tem non attingere? Habent pul-tem, qua saturari possunt ac debent, refrenent aliquando cupiditates immodicas, quod appetant reliquum est nihil, omnia enumeravi, omnia ordine perlustravi, inveni tandem extensionem, eam realem, substantialem, denique essentiam corporis esse contendendo», CLAUBERG 1652, p. 458, cf. CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1070.

«Quid aliud erit externas istas formas novisse, quam vitrum lambere cum vulpe et pul-tem non attingere? [...] vero cortex ille externorum accidentium, cui rerum corporearum medulla maximaeque naturae delitiae includuntur, non ulli sensui est pervius, neque ut vulpi pul-tem ita nobis naturae medullam prius degustasse contigit, verum primae aetatis cogitationes totae occupatae fuerunt in externo tantum cortice lambendo. [...] Omnes illae sensuum perceptiones, quibus in lambendo utimur, [...] nos avocant ab intimis naturae penetralibus», DE RAEY 1654, p. 26, cf. ID. *Oratio de gradibus et vitiis notitiae vulgaris*, 1651, p. 24.

Since this metaphor is used to illustrate two different kinds of errors, and the same metaphor is used by Anton Deusing with regard to the use of senses and reason in physics in his *Oratio de recta philosophiae naturalis conquirendae methodo* (1639, 1644), this text seems to be De Raey's source⁶⁴. However, one cannot exclude an influence from Clauberg. A last similarity concerns a critique to rarefaction as a proof against the Cartesian notion of matter, and can be found in De Raey's *Oratio*:

⁶⁴ Cf. ANTON DEUSING, *Oratio de recta philosophiae naturalis conquirendae methodo*, in ID., *Naturae theatrum universale*, Hardervici, apud Nicolaum a Wieringen 1644, p. 12.

«Verum enimvero, nondum id effecimus ut quiescant adversarii, quin potius a categoriis, tanquam e vestibulo philosophiae suae depulsi ad naturalis scientiae castra se recipiunt, ut physicae nostrae fundamentum evertant, e physica petitis armis pugnaturi. Obstant igitur rarefactionis et condensationis experimenta. Si substantiae materialis, inquiunt, essentia in extensione consisteret, qui fieri posset, ut corpus aliquod absque novae materiae appositione plus extensionis acquireret? [...] Variatur igitur et mutatur extensio, substantia manet eadem, neque proinde substantia est extensio», CLAUBERG 1652, pp. 460-461, cf. CLAUBERG 1691, p. 107 1; DESCARTES, *Principia philosophiae*, II, § 5.

«Ubi corpus aliquod expanditur et maius fit, nihil ipsi accedere, ubi ad minorem contrahitur quantitatem, nihil ipsi recedere putamus, quoties id oculis corporeis non fit conspicuum; et quicquid in auras abit sensumque omnem effugit, id ex rerum etiam natura abiisse ac prorsus evanuisse nobis persuademus», DE RAEY 1654, p. 28, cf. ID. *Oratio de gradibus et vitiis notitiae vulgaris*, 1651, p. 25.

De Raey's *Clavis*, finally, is mentioned by Clauberg in chapter XXXIV of his *Defensio, De praeiudiciis infantiae dissertatio tertia, in qua errores aliquot in cognoscendo et colendo Deo commissi, quatenus a praeiudiciis procedunt, deteguntur ac refutantur*. This is the last chapter of his *Defensio* devoted to childish prejudices, and it is based on a disputation held by Clauberg in 1651⁶⁵. De Raey accounts in his *Clavis* for the sources of idolatry from a philosophical point of view, showing that pantheism and the anthropomorphic notion of God come from the use of senses in the acknowledgement of the idea of God. One can find similar arguments in Clauberg's *Defensio*⁶⁶. De Raey's *Clavis* is mentioned

⁶⁵ His *Disputationum philosophicarum de causis imperfectionum mentis humanae in rebus cognoscendis quarta, de praeiudiciis infantiae tertia. In qua errores aliquot in cognoscendo et colendo Deo commissi, quatenus a praeiudiciis procedunt, dereguntur ac refutantu*. Text is missing.

⁶⁶ CLAUBERG 1652, pp. 516-518, §§ 7-11; CLAUBERG 1691, pp. 1086-1087, §§ 7-11; DE RAEY 1654, pp. 91-93.

three times in this chapter, in the 1691 edition of Clauberg's *Defensio*: references are to the second and third section of the chapter *De origine motus*, based on De Raey's *Disputatio de origine motus secunda* and *tertia*, held on 9th and 13th December of 1651. Undoubtedly, Clauberg's text appeared before De Raey's disputations: indeed, some of the arguments referred to by Clauberg can be found only in De Raey's 1654 *Clavis*, whereas they are missing in his 1651 disputations. Both Clauberg's and De Raey's texts present an historical overview of the history of the idolatrous notion of God: namely, of the belief in the corporeal nature of God. Clauberg mentions the Hebrews, the Manichaeans and the Stoics as the main sects concerned with a materialist understanding of God⁶⁷. In his *Clavis* – but not in his 1651 disputations – De Raey mentions Noah as having spread the right, revealed notion of God. Still, such notion had been forgotten in favour of some form of Manichaeism. Only the Hebrews, actually, kept the notion of a transcendental God⁶⁸. This exception in the history of ancient world is mentioned through Clauberg's reference to De Raey's *Clavis*⁶⁹: however, it cannot be found in his 1651 disputation. It seems beyond any doubt that De Raey was influenced by Clauberg in outlining a short history of idolatry, as well as in providing a Cartesian explanation for it. In fact, in paragraph 13 to 17 of the same chapter, Clauberg acknowledges the specific cause of the belief in the divinity of orbs in the prejudice of their beauty and perfection. The same argument can be found in De Raey's *De Aristotele et aristotelicis* (1669), published along with the second

67 CLAUBERG 1652, pp. 516-518, §§ 7-10; CLAUBERG 1691, pp. 1086-1087, §§ 7-10.

68 DE RAEY 1654, pp. 92-93.

69 «Verum non stoïci modo aliiq̃ ante memorati corporeum Deum conceperunt, sed universus pene terrarum orbis, paucis exceptis qui e puriori divinae revelationis fonte biberunt, propter similem adorandum numen imaginandi modum foedissima inundatus fuit idolatria. *Conf. De Raey Clavis phil. nat. cap. de orig. motus § 6*», CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1087, italics denotes a new insertion in respect to CLAUBERG 1652, p. 518.

edition of his *Clavis*, of which it summarizes most part of its contents⁷⁰. Such similarity is close to another explicit reference of Clauberg to De Raey⁷¹, as they both quote Aristotle's *De coelo*, where orbs are defined as living and divine having a round shape and incessantly moving⁷². In this case, however, the quotation is present in De Raey's *Disputatio de origine motus secunda*. In addition, one can notice a last, common element in the history of idolatry, to be found in another reference to the third section of the chapter *De origine motus* of De Raey's *Clavis*. As this reference concerns Anaxagoras, who acknowledged the purely natural being of the sun and was accused of atheism by Athenians⁷³, the lines mentioned by Clauberg can be found in De Raey's *Clavis*⁷⁴ but not in his 1651 *Disputatio de origine motus tertia*, since this does not contain De Raey's history of idolatry.

In sum, the similarities present in chapter XXXIV of Clauberg's *Defensio* with De Raey's texts demonstrate a clear influence of Clauberg on De Raey. Whereas in the previous chapters references and similarities can testify a mutual influence, this is not the case of the considerations on idolatry. This very case can suggest that also the previous disputations of Clauberg influenced

70 CLAUBERG 1652, pp. 519-521, CLAUBERG 1691, pp. 1087-1088; DE RAEY 1677, pp. 209-210.

71 «Et ne vulgares modo animas huic supersitioni implicitas fuisse putes, vide quid sentiat [...] Aristoteles lib. 2 de Coelo cap. 3 “unumquodque eorum, quorum est opus, id est operis causa: Dei vero operatio immortalitas est. Hoc autem est perpetua vita, quare Deo perpetuum inesse motum, necesse est. Cum vero coelum sit tale (est enim corpus quoddam divinum) eo corpus habet rotundum, quod natura semper in orbe movetur”. (Vide etiam De Raei *Clav. phil. nat. sect. 2 de orig. motus thes. 11* [...])», CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1088. Italics denotes a new insertion in respect to CLAUBERG 1652, pp. 522-523.

72 DE RAEY 1654, pp. 79-80. Cf. ID. (*praes.*), GUALTERUS MIRKINIUS (*resp.*), *Disputationum physicarum ad problemata Aristotelis tertiae de origine motus, pars secunda*, Lugduni Batavorum, e typographeo Francisci Hackii 1651, § 11; ARISTOTLE, *De coelo*, 286a 8-12.

73 «Athenienses Anaxagoram Clazomenium capitis fere damnassent, ideo quod solem, quem pro Deo colebant, dixissent [...] candentem laminam, sive potius [...] globum igneum. [...] Vide [...] De Raei *Clav. philos. natur. sect. 3 de orig. motus § 5*», CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1089. Italics denotes a new insertion in respect to CLAUBERG 1652, p. 525.

74 DE RAEY 1654, p. 89.

the contents of De Raey's texts. Still, the lack of the original texts of Clauberg's disputations does not exclude later interpolations by Clauberg in his *Defensio*, as the result of their discussion or even of De Raey's personal notes on the proofs of Clauberg's *Defensio* – which De Raey required in his first letter. In any case, such similarities concern some chapters of Clauberg's *Defensio* not directly aimed to rebuke Revius's criticism. Whether being Clauberg a source for De Raey or *vice versa*, however, De Raey's texts were considered by Clauberg as a source of clarifications for his *Defensio*. Still, no references to De Raey's texts are present in the first edition of *Defensio*, nor this is mentioned in De Raey's *Clavis*: this, actually, can to be explained in the light of the secrecy to be kept on their cooperation. Eventually, the first explicit reference to De Raey can be found in Clauberg's *Initiatio* (1655), where Clauberg refers to De Raey's theory of intellectual *praecognita*, expounded in his *Clavis*, on which physics is to be based⁷⁵.

PERSPECTIVES ON RESEARCH SOURCES

Few further conclusions can be drawn from the three here published letters and from the textual concordances of *Clavis* and *Defensio*. Eventually, by them one can recognize De Raey's close cooperation with Clauberg in 1651 and 1652, which saw the involvement of Wittich, Heidanus and Andreae as well.

⁷⁵ «Observationes et experimenta sensuum toti philosophiae non praestruimus, sed physicae aliisque particularibus disciplinis reservamus. [...] Et quidem experientiae aliquem omnino locum inter praecognita physica damus, sed longe potiorum rationi atque intelligentiae, quae de re consulatur Clariss. D. de Raei in Clavi philosophiae naturalis pag. 41 et seqq.», JOHANNES CLAUBERG, *Initiatio philosophi, sive dubitatio cartesiana, ad metaphysicam certitudinem viam aperiens*, Lugduni Batavorum et Duisburgi Clivorum, ex officina Adriani Wyngaerden 1655, pp. 428-429; CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1214.

Nevertheless, these texts do not offer clear evidences on the actual influence of De Raey on the overall strategy followed by Clauberg in his *Defensio* and then in his *Logica*, where he aims to integrate syllogistics with Descartes's method. The conciliative attitude of De Raey could have some influence on Clauberg's philosophy: however, whereas De Raey expounded, in his *Clavis*, a concordance of old and new physics by interpreting few phrases of Aristotle in the light of Descartes's principles, Clauberg developed a more consistent integration of old and new paradigm in logic. The novantique logic, thus, seems to have been independently developed by Clauberg, looking for a re-formation of academic teaching since the years he spent in Groningen. On the other hand, in his *Unterschied zwischen der cartesianischer und der sonst in Schulen gebraeuchlicher Philosophie* (1657), later translated and edited as *Differentia inter cartesianam et alias in scholis usitatam philosophiam* (1679), De Raey's *Clavis* is mentioned as Clauberg stresses the differences between Cartesian and Scholastic philosophy, whereas one can recognize some similarities between the genuine thought of Aristotle and Descartes's⁷⁶. This was the very philosophical strategy pursued by De Raey: thus, a direct influence of De Raey is to be recognized in Clauberg's later *Differentia* rather than in his *Defensio*, whose similarities with De Raey's texts do not concern the main line of Clauberg's arguments⁷⁷. Ultimately, these unedited materials allow us to argue for a relation between De Raey and Clauberg more on par than the ac-

76 «Unum adhuc serio lectori inculcandum me cartesianam philosophiam scholasticae opposuisse non vero aristotelicae, qualis illa in se et per se est [...] siquidem demonstrari potest hanc in multis capitibus cum cartesiana magis quam cum scholastica concordare quod excellentissimus philosophus Johannes de Raey in Clave philosophiae naturalis bonam partem ostendit», JOHANNES CLAUBERG, *Differentia inter cartesianam et alias in scholis usitatam philosophiam*, Berolini, apud Rupertum Völckern 1679-1680, p. 43. Cf. ID., *Unterschied zwischen der cartesianischer und der sonst in Schulen gebraeuchlicher Philosophie*, Duisburg am Rhein, bei Adryan Wyngarten 1657, p. 65; CLAUBERG 1691, p. 1234.

77 *Supra*, n. 22.

knowledgements present in the *Epistolae dedicatariae* opening Clauberg's *Logica* and *Physica* suggest⁷⁸. Clauberg came to Leiden after having already published his *Ontosophia* (1647) and only in order to finalize his acknowledgment of Cartesian philosophy. If he submitted to De Raey all his major works, these were independently developed by Clauberg. Actually, the discovery and the analysis of further letters could allow a more deep analysis of their relations and influences: the present edition of De Raey's letters, in fact, demonstrates the essential value of the analysis of unedited correspondence in the history of early modern philosophy.

ANDREA STRAZZONI

ERASMUS UNIVERSITY, ROTTERDAM

⁷⁸ *Supra*, nn. 6, 10.